

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Lewis, Patricia and Adamson, Maria and Biese, Ingrid and Kelan, Elisabeth (2019) Introduction to Special Issue: Exploring the Emergence of Moderate Feminism(s) in Contemporary Organizations. *Gender, Work & Organization* (26). pp. 1063-1072. ISSN 0968-6673.

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12407>

Link to record in KAR

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/76445/>

Document Version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

Introduction to Special Issue: Exploring the Emergence of Moderate Feminism(s) in Contemporary Organizations

Patricia Lewis, Maria Adamson, Ingrid Biese and Elisabeth Kelan

This special issue explores the complexities and complications attached to the contemporary public embracing of (some) feminist norms. It is inspired by a combination of optimism at the new luminosity accorded to feminism as a way of thinking which seeks to secure a better life for all women and concern at the selective take-up of feminist principles. The latter includes the restrained (or exploitative) implementation of notions of empowerment, choice and agency giving rise to a moderation of feminism as a theoretical and political force (Dean, 2010; Eisenstein, 2009). The emergence of moderate forms of feminism has been analysed in terms of postfeminism (Dean, 2010; Hollows & Moseley, 2006; Gill & Orgad, 2017; Lewis, 2014; McRobbie, 2015), neoliberal feminism (Rottenberg, 2014, 2018), popular feminism (Banet-Weiser, 2015, 2018), choice feminism (Kirkpatrick, 2010), market feminism (Kantola & Squires, 2012), transnational business feminism (Roberts, 2015) and corporate feminism (Arruzza et al, 2018). Despite the variation in analytic vantage points, central to all versions of moderate feminism is the individuated female subject who recognises the persistence of gender inequalities but perceives the solution to inequality as dependent on individual action. This orientation transforms ‘...collective liberation based upon a commitment to the common good into a limited form of individuated self-care’ (Rottenberg, 2014: 433). Moderate feminism(s) are therefore characterised by an implicit or explicit distancing from a broader critique of structural inequalities. This means that the onus for the achievement of equality is placed on the individual woman with female success being dependent on personal initiative. Thus securing gender equality is treated as something that is internally referential and reliant on each individual female subject as opposed to an

externally structured phenomenon, which requires reformation of social structures and gendered norms (Baker, 2010).

While other disciplinary fields such as Cultural Studies, International Relations and Political Science have interrogated this emerging form of feminism in detail, the field of Gender and Organization Studies has given less attention to the mainstreaming of moderate feminism(s). In recognition of this lacuna, this special issue explores the impact and consequences of the contemporary 'taming' of feminism in a variety of organizational situations. In this introduction we will briefly outline the emergence of the public embrace of a moderated feminism providing the context for the special issue. While we acknowledge that other concepts can be drawn on to explore the 'taming' of feminism we do this from the analytical vantage point of postfeminism. As a sensibility or discursive formation, postfeminism has contributed to the contemporary reconfiguration of feminism in moderate form through the constitution of a particular way of thinking about gender in (Western) society. In addition to responding to feminism through a process of 'domestication' and 'taming', postfeminism is partially constituted through the ubiquity of neoliberal principles. As modes of governmentality, both postfeminism and neoliberalism place an emphasis on individualised, internal solutions to problems alongside the disavowal of external social structures as sources of pressure for individuals requiring collective, external action (Gill, 2008). There is a close alignment between the 'autonomous, calculating, self-regulating subject of neoliberalism' and the 'active, freely choosing, self-reinventing subject of postfeminism'. The demand to self-manage and self-discipline is one which is directed strongly at women who are required to regulate all aspects of their conduct signalling the strong possibility that neoliberalism is gendered and that women are its ideal subjects (Gill, 2008: 443). Catherine Rottenberg is also clear that her development of the notion of neoliberal feminism was completed against the background of Gill and McRobbie's conceptualization of

postfeminism ⁽¹⁾. In exploring the impact of the moderation of feminism, the authors who contribute to this special issue mainly draw on postfeminism and neoliberalism either individually or together, in developing their analyses.

Repudiating and Embracing Feminism in Postfeminist Times

Repudiating feminism in early accounts of postfeminism

A variety of feminist perspectives have been drawn on in organization studies to inform the study of gender *in* and the gendering *of* organizations including liberal, radical, psychoanalytic, Marxist, socialist, poststructuralist, postcolonial feminisms. These have given conceptual shape to the scholarly work that has investigated gendered inequalities within organizations over the past forty years (Calas et al, 2014). However, engagement with the notion of postfeminism (e.g. Adamson, 2017; Adamson & Kelan, 2019; Kelan, 2008; Lewis, 2014; Lewis & Simpson, 2017; Lewis et al, 2018) within the field of Gender and Organization Studies has made clear that it should not be treated as a theoretical identification. Instead, approaching postfeminism as a critical concept understood in terms of a discursive formation, allows us to explore the persistence of gendered disparities within organizational contexts while also continually interrogating and tracking its changing form (Gill et al, 2017; Gill, 2017; Lewis, 2014; Lewis et al, 2017). As an object of analysis and a critical concept, there is no single, definitive interpretation of postfeminism. Rather there are a range of conceptualisations signalling the malleability, power and multi-faceted nature of this theoretical resource – for reviews of the variety of interpretations both generally and in the field of gender and organization studies specifically see Gill (2007), Gill et al (2017), Lewis (2014, 2018) and Tasker & Negra (2007). However, as well as acknowledging that there are multiple interpretations of postfeminism, it is also important to recognise that to understand this cultural phenomenon, particularly in relation to the contemporary luminosity of

feminism, we must consider its different phases (Dejmanee, 2015; Gill, 2017; Nash & Grant, 2015).

In the early considerations of postfeminism (e.g. Gill, 2007; McRobbie, 2004, 2009) attention was directed at women's disidentification with feminist action. Scharff (2012) cites a survey completed in 2006 that indicated that 71% of British women rejected feminism as a way of living and form of identity. This stance was linked to the belief that gender equality had been achieved and feminist action was no longer required. This led writers such as McRobbie to assert her (by now) famous formulation of a double entanglement connected to the re-stabilisation of traditional gender norms alongside access to the labour market and an emphasis on choice and empowerment for women. In other words, feminism has achieved a taken-for-granted stance such that the acceptance of the principle of equality is now part of our common sense and therefore as a political and/or theoretical stance, it is now outmoded and anachronistic – feminism has to be treated as obsolete if it is to be taken-into-account (McRobbie, 2004, 2009). As a discursive regime, postfeminism (in the first iterations) is characterised as a response to feminism – one that seeks its undoing and disarticulation through routine mocking as a movement that is “over” and “past it” (Gill and Orgad, 2017). The claim of a repudiation of feminism is a central characteristic of early interpretations of postfeminism and presented as a defining feature of this discursive formation. However, this stance was challenged by writers such as Hollows and Moseley (2006: 15) who argued that the ‘cultural space of postfeminism cannot simply be equated with a denunciation of, and non-identity with, feminist politics’. Similarly, Dean (2010) asserted that within a postfeminist cultural context the interplay between disidentification with and affirmation of feminism is better understood as a disavowal of an “excessive” feminism cast as anti-male while privileging a more moderate form of feminism that does not seek to overthrow the existing gender order or pursue female dominance.

Embracing Feminism

The disavowal of an “excessive” feminism in favour of a more moderate version signals a shift in postfeminism’s narrative from an emphasis on repudiation to a focus on feminism’s rehabilitation as ‘cool’, ‘progressive’ and ‘valuable’. Through this rehabilitation, moderate feminism is treated as the force that ‘delivered’ the gender and sexual equality that is said to be definitive of ‘modern’ societies (Hemmings, 2018). This shift in narrative supports a ‘...reconciliation between feminism and femininity, which no longer exist separately from each other instead manifesting as a symbiotic co-existence’ (Lewis, 2018: 27). Indeed, Hemmings (2018: 968) refers to this reconciliation as the suturing of femininity to feminism ‘...in a conscious inversion of that historical relationship’. Writers such as McRobbie (2015) and Gill (2017) now acknowledge that a shift from repudiation to rehabilitation has occurred. However, critical scholars increasingly express concern at the way in which feminist action in work organizations, the mainstream media and popular culture has been conflated with the tenets of a liberal feminism which conceptualises ‘true equality’ as ‘...predicated upon individuals moving up the professional ladder, *one woman at a time*’ (emphasis in original) (Rottenberg, 2014: 426). As McRobbie (2015: 12) argues feminism characterised by collectivism and a concern for the welfare of all – what Arruzza *et al* (2018) refer to as a feminism for the 99 per cent - is discarded in favour of an instrumentalised and personalised version with feminist action turned ‘...into an inner drive, a determination to meet self-directed goals’.

As the perception of progress and emancipation for women is closely linked to the issue of labour market access, organizations and the world of work in general, are identified as key sites for the operationalisation and implementation of moderate feminism. However, critics (e.g. Arruzza *et al*; Eisenstein, 2009; Fraser, 2013) of this version of feminism perceive it as an ally of neoliberalism that is unlikely to benefit the majority of women. The emphasis

of moderate feminism on the 'business case' for gender equality champions women as crucial to the delivery of economic competitiveness and growth but this tends to translate into a focus on women in professional and managerial positions who are open to the calls to 'lean in' and to individually 'crack the glass ceiling' to secure access to positions of power (Arruzza et al, 2018). Analyses of the way in which women constitute self-reliant identities increasingly focus on the governance techniques used to influence their endeavours. Not only are women encouraged to work on their bodies, they are also called to engage in psychological self-work (Gill & Kanai, 2018) so that they are equipped to deal with work challenges as solitary individuals who are not part of a permanent collective group. As du Gay (1996 cited in Binkley 2007: 119) argues: 'individuals (in postfeminist and neoliberal times) are discouraged from seeing life in terms of any collectivist obligation or shared purpose and encouraged to undertake their lives as projects of heightened individuality, self-reliance and opportunity maximization...'. Accordingly, understanding postfeminism as a governmental rationality that acts to seduce and convince women to govern themselves in line with the individualistic tenets of moderate feminism (and neoliberalism), increased scholarly attention is now directed at the emphasis placed on the need for women to develop self-confidence to ensure individualised success. Securing access to senior leadership positions, improvements in women's representation on corporate boards and constructing a harmonious work-life balance are deemed possible by increasing women's level of self-confidence (Gill and Orgad, 2015, 2017).

As a technology of self, 'confidence' which is historically and culturally specific to the contemporary postfeminist era, is presented as the means by which women can constitute themselves as independent, individualised, self-reliant (postfeminist) subjects. Emphasising confidence promotes the idea that strategies for career success lie within women themselves such that '...an intensive programme of individually based cognitive, behavioural, embodied

(neuro) linguistic ‘reprogramming’...will bring into being a newly upgraded self, a proto-feminist subject...’ (Gill & Orgad, 2017: 29). Thus through the development of a confident mind-set, women are encouraged to look to themselves and to devise individual solutions to facilitate the management of an increasingly complex work and life burden. Confidence is also a central tenet promoted in celebrity businesswomen’s autobiographies as they narrate their stories of achievement and success and encourage other women to follow suit. Adamson & Kelan (2019) show how in these texts, confidence is constructed as a central ingredient for women to be able to jump over gendered barriers alongside developing other personal characteristics such as control to manage gendered obstacles and courage to take-on and respond strongly to impediments to success. The ‘female hero’ ideal constructed by celebrity businesswomen in their biographies, acts as an enticement to all women, presenting the possibility of achieving success solely by individually adjusting to and navigating structurally produced career obstructions. Accordingly, success can be secured through personal change, self-discipline and making the ‘right’ choices, thereby taking full individual responsibility for succeeding or failing. Similarly, as part of this psychological turn, attention is also directed at the regulatory ideal of ‘building resilience’. Individuals are urged to develop an ability to ‘bounce back’ from adversity, using the occurrence of injuries – either physical or psychological – as learning opportunities in such a way that the experience of continuous struggle and recovery within an insecure economic environment is normalised (Gill & Orgad, 2018). In the second phase or new iteration of postfeminism, disavowal of structural and systemic causes of continued gender inequalities does not occur through the repudiation of feminism but rather through the acceptance, embracing and celebration of a moderate feminism which emphasises individualism, entrepreneurialism and the nurturing of a mind-set which is characterised by self-confidence and resilience (Gill & Orgad, 2017, 2018).

Given the recent growth and proliferation of individualised 'psy' solutions to gender inequality which focus on disciplining the internal self, a key question to consider is whether the cultural battle for feminism has been 'won' by moderated individualised feminism(s). Does the support and promotion of individualised forms of feminism by nation states, international organisations and business corporations subsume and silence all other forms of feminist expression? Alternatively does the contemporary luminosity of moderate, individualised feminism provide a mainstream space for more radical forms of feminism that arguably was not present until now. As stated earlier in this introduction, one of the key relationships connected to the postfeminist reconfiguration of feminism as a moderate force is the alignment with neoliberalism. Some critics contend that such moderated forms of feminism have become allies of the neoliberal order such that feminism's radical potential to disrupt the status quo has been co-opted and lost (Arruzza et al, 2018; Eisenstein, 2009; Fraser, 2013). In contrast, others suggest that while the moderation of feminism by the cultural phenomenon of postfeminism and its ally neoliberalism have redefined emancipation as personal rather than collective, this process and interaction is more than a simple co-optation (Rottenberg, 2018). The articles in this special issue also suggest that the answer to the question of the change potential of the new moderate feminisms is far from straightforward, highlighting the complexities involved in the development of new ideas about what constitutes contemporary feminism(s).

Overview of the special issue

An excellent collection of articles that outline the roots and impact of moderate feminism(s) and their positioning in the Gender and Organization Studies field are contained in this special issue. Catherine Rottenberg's fascinating article 'Women who work: The limits of the neoliberal feminist paradigm' opens the issue. She offers a critical reading of Ivanka Trump's

book *Women Who Work* arguing that it represents the newest version of the neoliberal feminist subject. Positioning this text as part of the contemporary cultural landscape, she argues that feminism in its moderated neoliberal form has now become part of our commonsense in relation to issues of gender and women's engagement with the world of work. The article begins with an overview of neoliberal feminism and following this she demonstrates how the principles of this moderate form of feminism are embedded in Trump's book. Highlighting the way in which Trump pays lip service to structural obstacles for gender equality, Rottenberg argues that the neoliberal female subject that is constructed in the book is required to engage in the constant crafting of her best possible self by optimizing all aspects of her life in a similar manner to business organizations. Through this form of self-optimization, the public and private self-merge into one. This means that the traditional public/private divide is collapsed and reconfigured in a novel way. While the neoliberal female subject plans her life with business-like precision, she also relies on other, less privileged women to make this felicitous work–family balance work. Rottenberg concludes the paper by arguing that an unintended consequence of the emergence of neoliberal feminism as a moderating force is that it has paradoxically paved the way for more transformational forms of feminism to assert themselves. She ends by asking how we can sustain the expression of more radical forms of feminism which seek widespread collective change while at the same time rejecting neoliberal feminist logic.

In their thought-provoking article, 'Neoliberal feminism: The neoliberal rhetoric on feminism by Australian political actors', Linda Colley and Catherine White trace the resurgence of feminism in Australian politics and consider what they refer to as the bizarre situation of conservative women avoiding the label 'feminist' while conservative men embrace it. Contextualizing the revival of feminism in terms of a shift from an empowering, collective movement to an individualized neoliberal form and using ideographical rhetorical

criticism, they investigate how four conservative politicians use the terms feminist and feminism. Their analysis demonstrates the emphasis conservative women place on securing gender equality while paradoxically rejecting the feminist label perceiving the term as an 'outmoded notion of female disadvantage'. In contrast, there appears to be no such reticence on the part of conservative men who are keen to adopt the position of feminist, treating alignment with feminism as a political asset which bolsters their appeal to women voters. Analysis of this 'claiming' is demonstrated to be more strategic than ideological but with the consequence of valorizing the neoliberal feminist subject. Colley and White also highlight how the rejection of a feminist identity by conservative women politicians is a manifestation of their own neoliberal feminist subjectivity. The article contributes to our understanding of how the rise of neoliberal feminism becomes an object in discourse which actors position themselves to by either rejecting or endorsing it.

Kate Grosser and Lauren McCarthy in 'Imagining new feminist futures: How feminist social movements contest the neoliberalization of feminism in an increasingly corporate-dominated world', present an engaging exploration of how the growth of corporate power has contributed to the neoliberalization of feminism. They argue that processes of neoliberalization are driven by the corporate social responsibility agendas of corporations and the influence they exert in governance arenas. However, drawing on social movement theory they challenge the contention that feminism has been completely co-opted by neoliberal agendas, thereby losing touch with its wider social change objectives. In working with social movement theory - specifically political opportunities, mobilizing structures and strategic framing processes – Grosser and McCarthy explore how feminist social movements organize themselves and agitate for change. Their analysis suggests that feminist social movements have, despite challenges to their agendas, not been co-opted by neoliberalism after all, but robustly co-exist with it, developing a variety of strategies that contest the

neoliberalization of feminism. They argue that while the development of CSR initiatives have played a significant part in the emergence of neoliberal feminism, such programmes also give rise to new sites and processes of struggles providing opportunities for feminist contestation of the moderation of feminism. The point they emphasise is that the emergence of neoliberal feminism does not shut out more radical forms of feminism but rather provides 'openings to challenge oppressive power relations'.

In their paper 'Transnational business feminism: Exporting feminism in the global economy', Eva Fodor, Christy Glass and Beata Nagy present an insightful examination of the way in which 'western' logics of business feminism are 'exported' to and negotiated in the context of Hungary. Drawing on an analysis of observations and interviews with women executives in Hungary, the authors trace how gender policies, practices and ideas from western corporate headquarters are translated and implemented in the local Hungarian context. They demonstrate how executive women in these transnational companies act as ambassadors for business feminism. Despite acknowledging a range of local contextual factors that impede gender equality, the 'solution' to these structural constraints attributed to the nature of Hungarian society, is presented as the embedding of business feminism in the local context. Individual characteristics such as assertiveness, confidence and ambition are depicted by the female executives as central to women's progress within Hungary. Importantly, the article makes visible the mechanisms by which the cross-national translation of moderate feminist logics from a western to non-western context occurs, highlighting the prominent role multinational corporations and their officers play in shaping this process across the globe. For the authors, a key question therefore, is whether multinational organizations which promote business feminism with a limited focus on serving the demands of corporations, can restrict and exclude other types of feminist ideas.

Shelley Budgeon in 'The resonance of moderate feminism and the gendered relations of austerity' presents an illuminating discursive analysis of media representations of the policy of austerity in mainstream British newspapers between 2010 and 2015. This analysis does two things: first, she makes visible the way in which gender is involved in rendering austerity meaningful as a policy response to the global financial crisis. Second, she shows how the gendering of austerity facilitated the presentation of the crisis as a 'crisis-in' as opposed to a 'crisis-of' neoliberal capitalism. The former interpretation characterised the financial crisis as a routine and temporary occurrence while the latter entails a fundamental questioning of the prevailing economic and social arrangements. Media representations of the global crisis as 'routine and temporary' through accounts of austerity '...quelled alternative narratives while normalizing a return to the pre-crisis status quo'. In exploring how the maintenance of the status quo is secured, she pays attention to the way in which particular constructions of gender – such as essentialized claims of gender difference - are used to constitute the crisis as something which could be resolved internally through the management of fiscal spending. Drawing on this familiar understanding of the gender order reduced levels of uncertainty and restored the familiar 'natural' order. An important claim of the analysis is the way in which the return to 'business as usual' is facilitated by the existing institutionalisation of a moderate feminism foreclosing radical feminist positions engaged in a sustained questioning of the political and economic system. While Budgeon concludes that a reformist liberal feminist orientation has dominated all of the available pro-feminist space, she argues that we should continue to question the likelihood that this dominance will persist.

Sharon Mavin, Carole Elliott, Valerie Stead and Jannine Williams take a by-now notorious photograph of Theresa May and Nicola Sturgeon (former UK Prime Minister and First Minister of Scotland respectively) as the subject of their paper 'Economies of visibility

as a moderator of feminism: 'Never mind Brexit. Who won Legs-it!' The photograph was taken in the context of a meeting between these two politicians with the focus being on the bodies of the female leaders – specifically their legs – as opposed to the content of the encounter. They conduct an in-depth multimodal discursive analysis of media outputs relating to the photograph through the lens of Banet-Weiser's (2015) notion of economies of visibility. The latter highlights how women are interpellated within a postfeminist neoliberal context to be *seen* to be actively investing in themselves as empowered, agentic subjects with an individual's visibility acting as a new form of currency. What is particularly notable is that it is the feminine body which is made visible and subject to evaluation and scrutiny thereby gendering economies of visibility. For Mavin et al, it is the call to women to produce themselves as visibly empowered, entrepreneurial, *feminine* subjects that acts as a moderator on feminism. While women such as Theresa May and Nicola Sturgeon can disrupt the masculine norm by holding leadership positions, the required visibility of the feminine body restricts their potential and diminishes their power. Nevertheless, as their perceptive analysis shows, the insistence on femininity through appearance can act to provoke feminist voices which challenge this focus.

In her paper 'Accounting for equality: Gender budgeting and moderate feminism', Ulrike Marx explores how quantification and calculative practices have become central to contemporary forms of organizing. Set within the context of scholarship which questions the neutrality and disinterestedness of numbers and other technical indicators, she presents an astute analysis of the role of quantification in governing equality. While modes of accounting have been interpreted as the means to 'soften' feminist demands by translating them into matters of technocratic governance, quantification is also a potent means to give feminism a voice, making inequalities highly visible, moving discussion of gender discrimination out of the margins into the centre of political debate. However, drawing on

the case of gender budgeting in Austria she investigates the de-radicalization of this initiative, demonstrating how it lost its radical edge through a process of neoliberal recuperation of feminist critique. Gender budgeting was originally a response to criticism of the way in which budgeting decision-making processes reinforce gender inequalities. In response to this critique, the idea of gender budgeting has developed into practices that link public sector budgeting with gender equality objectives. While originally implemented with radical aims in mind, Marx argues that gender equality in Austria has become an element of neoliberal governmentality, through neoliberal rationalities rather than in opposition to them. She thus suggests that gender budgeting in Austria has facilitated the co-optation of feminist ideals by translating demands for gender equality into neoliberal calculative practices of governmentality connected to policy goals such as the integration of women into employment. Based on this empirical investigation, Marx argues that feminist scholars need to be attentive to and mindful of the intended and unintended effects of practices of quantification for feminist action.

Charikleia Tzanakou and Ruth Pearce in their article 'Moderate feminism within or against the neoliberal university? The example of Athena SWAN' present a critical and empirical analysis of the Athena SWAN (Scientific Women's Academic Network) charter mark, which has been established to recognize and promote good practice in advancing gender equality in higher education and research institutions in the UK. The authors argue that the charter is a product of neoliberalization within academic environments which reflects a tendency towards accountability, metrics and a performative doing of equality work. Using the notion of moderate feminism inflected with neoliberal principles as an analytical framework, they examine the advantages and disadvantages of Athena SWAN as well as its potential, within a neoliberal university model that focuses on business and market imperatives. The analysis demonstrates that although the charter can result in

cultural change and initiatives to increase gender equality, the burden of this work often falls upon women and other marginalized groups in the higher education sector. By providing a better understanding of the charter's contradictions and limitations, the authors hope to provide insights which will support the future development of Athena SWAN. In particular, they suggest that taking a pragmatic approach to an initiative such as Athena SWAN, means exploring how this moderate tool can be used to pursue more radical change. This article provides important insights into the design and implementation of gender interventions in organizations on a wider scale, as these have become increasingly prevalent, especially within the EU.

In the final article of the special issue, Banu Özkazanç-Pan asks what types of feminisms are needed in the time of #MeToo to change gendered systems and structures which have facilitated sexual harassment and assault? Is it possible to imagine a world in which women do not have to 'accept' gender-based criminal behaviours or incivility? Focusing on the notion of agency as a catalyst for change, she considers how this is conceptualized by different feminist perspectives. Agency located in the individual is associated with perspectives such as liberal feminism, neoliberal feminism and postfeminism and materializes as 'choice'. She coherently argues that while masculine structures may be engaged with, responded to and challenged by women participating in intentional, individual actions, these are not enough if we are to secure a deeper transformation of the contemporary gendered context. While individual action promoted by neoliberal feminism and postfeminism may provide some emancipatory possibilities, the primacy allocated to the individual woman is problematic because within it there is an unspoken acceptance – despite claims to the contrary – that not all women will benefit. In contrast, Özkazanç-Pan suggests that agency conceptualized by feminist perspectives such as intersectional, decolonial, postcolonial and transnational feminisms is likely to achieve the required

systemic change. This is because such perspectives are not separated from context, emphasize interaction, are explicitly concerned with dismantling oppressive structures and include women at the margins not just the advantaged few. Agency here is understood as a type of shared, radical politics which includes races, history and transnational dimensions when advocating for collective as opposed to individual struggle. The article thus draws attention to the structures under which #MeToo was possible but also how collective agency can ensure that these structures are changed.

Concluding Remarks

The nine articles that make up this special issue aim to provoke discussion about the presence of feminism(s) in organization contexts. Exploring the impact of the moderation of feminism is central to the work contained in the special issue, along with considering the wider opportunities that this 'taming' of feminism provides for the feminist movement. In this regard, the key underlying question is whether mainstream acceptance of a restrained feminism, with its focus on the psyche of individual women, stymies radical versions of feminism? Alternatively, has the take-up of moderate forms of feminism provided a visible space to call for structural and cultural reform to address the persistence of gender inequalities (Hemmings, 2018; Rottenberg, 2018)? Further research is required to address these questions and to explore in more detail what happens to feminism once it is taken up in mainstream organizational contexts.

End Notes

1. For an in-depth consideration of the relationship between postfeminism, neoliberal feminism and popular feminism please consult Banet-Weiser, Gill & Rottenberg (2019).

References

- Adamson, M. (2017). Postfeminism, neoliberalism and a successfully balanced femininity in celebrity CEO autobiographies. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(3), 314-327.
- Adamson, M. & Kelan, E. (2019). 'Female Heroes': Celebrity executives as postfeminist role models. *British Journal of Management*, DOI: 10.1111/1467-8551.12320.
- Arruzza, C., Bhattacharya, T., & Fraser, N. (2018). Notes for a feminist manifesto. *New Left Review*, 114(Nov Dec), 113-134.
- Baker, J. (2010). Claiming volition and evading victimhood: postfeminist obligations for young women. *Feminism and Psychology*, 20(2), 186-204.
- Banet-Weiser, S. (2015). Media, markets, gender: Economies of visibility in a neoliberal moment. *The Communication Review*, 18(1), 53-70.
- Banet-Weiser, S. (2018). *Empowered: Popular Feminism and Popular Misogyny*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Banet-Weiser, S., Gill, R., & Rottenberg, C. (2019). Postfeminism, popular feminism and neoliberal feminism? Sarah Banet-Weiser, Rosalind Gill and Catherine Rottenberg in conversation. *Feminist Theory*, DOI:10.1177/1464700119842555.
- Binkley, S. (2007). Governmentality and lifestyle studies. *Sociology Compass*, 1(1), 111-126.
- Calas, M., Smircich, L. and Holvino, E. (2014). Theorizing gender-and-organization: Changing times...Changing theories? In Kumra, S. Simpson, R. and Burke, R.J. (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Gender in Organizations*, pp. 17-52. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Dean, J. (2010). Feminism in the papers: Contested feminisms in the British quality press. *Feminist Media Studies*, 10(4), 391-407.
- Dejmanee, T. (2016). Consumption in the city: The turn to interiority in contemporary postfeminist television. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 19(2), 119-133.
- Eisenstein, H. (2009). *Feminism Seduced: How Global Elites Use Women's Labor and Ideas*. Boulder CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Fraser, N. (2013). *Fortunes of Feminism: From State-Managed Capitalism to Neoliberal Crisis*. London: Verso.
- Gill R, (2007). Postfeminist media culture: Elements of a Sensibility. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 10(2), 147-166
- Gill, R. (2008). Culture and subjectivity in neoliberal and postfeminist times. *Subjectivity*, 25(1), 432-445.
- Gill, R. (2017). The affective, cultural and psychic life of postfeminism. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 20(6), 606-626.
- Gill, R. & Akane, K. (2018). Mediating neoliberal capitalism: Affect, subjectivity and inequality. *Journal of Communication*, 68(2), 318-326.
- Gill, R., Kelan, E., & Scharff, C. (2017). A postfeminist sensibility at work. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(3), 226-244.
- Gill, R. & Orgad, S. (2015). The confidence culture. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 30(86), 324-344.
- Gill, R. & Orgad, S. (2017). Confidence culture and the remaking of feminism. *New Formations*, 91(1), 16-34.
- Gill, R. & Orgad, S. (2018) The amazing bounce-backable woman: Resilience and the psychological turn in neoliberalism. *Sociological Research Online*, 23(2), 477-495.

- Hemmings, C. (2018). Resisting popular feminisms: gender, sexuality and the lure of the modern. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 25(7), 963-977.
- Hollows, J. & Moseley, R. (2006). Popularity contests: The meanings of popular feminism. In Hollows, J. & Moseley, R. (eds) *Feminism in Popular Culture*, pp. 1-22. Oxford, UK: Berg.
- Kantola, J. & Squires, J. (2012). From state feminism to market feminism? *International Political Science Review*, 33(4), 382-400.
- Kelan, E. (2008). The discursive construction of gender in contemporary management literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81(2), 427-445.
- Kirkpatrick, J. (2010). Introduction: selling out? Solidarity and choice in the American feminist movement. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8(1), 241-245.
- Lewis, P. (2014). Postfeminism, femininities and organization studies; Exploring a new agenda. *Organization Studies*, 35(12), 1845-1866.
- Lewis, P. (2018). Postfeminism and Gendered (Im)mobilities. In Lewis, P., Benschop, Y., & Simpson, R. (eds) *Postfeminism and Organization* (pp. 21-42). New York: Routledge.
- Lewis, P., Benschop, Y., & Simpson, R. (2017). Postfeminism, gender and organization. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 23(4), 1-13.
- Lewis, P. & Simpson, R. (2017). Hakim revisited: Preference, choice and the postfeminist gender regime. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 23(3), 213-225.
- McRobbie, A. (2004). Post-feminism and popular culture. *Feminist Media Studies*, 4(3), 255-264.
- McRobbie, A. (2009). *The Aftermath of Feminism: Gender, Culture and Social Change*. London: Sage.
- McRobbie, A. (2015). Notes on the perfect. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 30(83), 3-20.
- Nash, M. & Grant, R. (2015). Twenty-something *Girls* V. thirty-something *Sex and the City* women: Paving the way for “post?feminism”. *Feminist Media Studies*, 15(6), 976-991.

- Roberts, A. (2015). The political economy of “transnational business feminism”. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 17(2), 209-231.
- Rottenberg, C. (2014). The rise of neoliberal feminism. *Cultural Studies*, 28(3), 418-437.
- Rottenberg, C. (2018). *The Rise of Neoliberal Feminism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Scharff, C. (2012). *Repudiating Feminism: Young Women in a Neoliberal World*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Tasker, Y. & Negra, D. (2007). *Interrogating Postfeminism*. London: Duke University Press.